



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,956	04/15/2005	Fumi Kawai	NGB-37326	7348
116 7590 12/17/2009 PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 9TH STREET SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			EXAMINER FINDLEY, CHRISTOPHER G	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/17/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/519,956

Applicant(s)

KAWAI, FUMI

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-25 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/09/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Re claims 13 and 24, the Applicant contends that the prior art cited fails to teach or suggest that multiple videos of the split display are related with each other and satisfy the related-video conditions required by the claim language. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The cited portion of Elberbaum (column 17, lines 4-10) relate to a buffer memory for data that is to be displayed, wherein the buffer memory is fed with video signals according to selection resulting from code and sync signals (Elberbaum: Fig. 18, code and sync extractor 100; column 16, lines 25-45). This corresponds to retrieval of the recorded signals by a select command of a time and date, camera identification and/or alarm particulars (Elberbaum: column 17, lines 55-57). Therefore, the related video (related by time and data, camera identification and or alarm particulars) correlates to the split screen previously cited by the Examiner.
3. Re claim 16, the Applicant contends that Elberbaum does not exclude the possibility that the based video and related videos are picked up by the same camera, and therefore fails to teach or suggest that "an imaging apparatus for picking up the related video and an imaging apparatus for picking up the base video are different respectively." However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Elberbaum discloses the capability of picking up different related videos, and therefore is capable of performing

the function claimed. The ability to accomplish more functions than what are claimed by the Applicant does not disqualify Elberbaum as prior art.

4. Re claim 22, the Applicant contends that the prior art cited merely teaches a memory for storing camera signals recorded during alarms, and is not related to the "priority rule." However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Princeton WordNet defines priority as "status established in order of importance or urgency" (<http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=priority>). The special treatment of alarm condition video (namely, storing it in a separate long-term memory) qualifies as granting such alarm video a status of importance. Therefore, the alarm signal storage is related to the priority rule.

5. Re claims 23 and 25, the Applicant contends that the benefits of the claimed subject matter are outlined in the Applicant's Specification (pp. 65, line 22 through pp. 66, line 4), and therefore the Examiner's assertion that its inclusion in the system would be an arbitrary decision of the system designer is false. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The portion of the Applicant's Specification relating to claims 23 and 25 merely states:

"In the conventional recording using only the normal recording area, the video showing the predetermined position must be searched every time from all the camera videos, by using a time 00:00:00 on the pointed day as an initial value of the date/hour information. However, the information indicating which camera shot the particular position at the particular time can be easily acquired by using the data table of the present invention."

Similarly, Elberbaum discloses that the recorded camera signals are retrieved from storage on the basis of recording time and date and/or the stored identification codes and/or the inputted alarm signals (Elberbaum: column 2, line 61-column 3, line 3), and

further indicating that this retrieval is instantaneous (Elberbaum: column 17, lines 55-57). As such, both the Applicant's Specification and the portions of Elberbaum cited herein claim to facilitate instant access to video data stored in a memory by utilizing timing and identification information. Therefore, the Applicant has failed to show a clear benefit of the claimed two-dimensional array over the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. **Claims 13-17, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Elberbaum (US 7171106 B2).**

Re **claim 13**, Elberbaum discloses a video generation processing apparatus comprising: a plurality of imaging apparatus each for picking up a video (Elberbaum: Figs. 1-8, 17, and 19 all show multiple cameras as inputs); video storing means for storing the videos picked up by the plurality of imaging apparatus and additional information of respective videos (Elberbaum: column 2, lines 37-42, "recording and retrieving video signals generated by a plurality of synchronized video transmitters, each incorporating an individually allotted identification code signal, into and from a

digital recorder having at least one main memory storage device for routinely recording the camera signals in endless rotation"); related-video condition generating means for generating related-video conditions that relate to base video from the video and an additional information stored in the video storing means (Elberbaum: column 2, lines 47-50, "storing the compressed individual signals along with the individual identification code thereof and the time and date of the recording in a continuous cycle into at least one main memory storage device to full capacity"); and video acquiring means for acquiring related video that meets the related-video conditions from the video storing means (Elberbaum: column 2, line 61-column 3, line 3), wherein the videos picked up by the plurality of imaging apparatus are processed so as to display a plurality of videos which are related with each other and satisfy the related-video conditions (Elberbaum: column 17, lines 4-10, multiple cameras may be selected for split display).

Re **claim 14**, Elberbaum discloses that the video generation processing apparatus acquires an imaging position information of the base video from video storing means by using first predetermined conditions that select the base video (Elberbaum: column 14, lines 34-43, location information may be included in the identification code), and generates the related-video conditions based on the acquired imaging position information and date/hour information contained in the first predetermined conditions (Elberbaum: column 2, lines 47-50, "storing the compressed individual signals along with the individual identification code thereof and the time and date of the recording in a continuous cycle into at least one main memory storage device to full capacity").

Re **claim 15**, Elberbaum discloses display processing means for processing the base video and the related video to display simultaneously on one screen (Elberbaum: column 17, lines 4-10, multiple cameras may be selected for split display).

Re **claim 16**, Elberbaum discloses that an imaging apparatus for picking up the related video and an imaging apparatus for picking up the base video are different respectively (Elberbaum: Figs. 1-8, 17, and 19 all show multiple cameras as inputs).

Re **claim 17**, Elberbaum discloses that the related-video conditions contain the imaging position information and the date/hour information (Elberbaum: column 14, lines 34-43, time/date and location information may be included in the identification code).

Re **claim 22**, Elberbaum discloses that respective videos are ordered in response to a priority rule when the related video contains at least two videos (Elberbaum: column 2, lines 42-44, alarm event data receives priority and is stored in a separate memory).

Claim 24 recites the corresponding method for implementation by the apparatus of claim 13. The arguments presented for claim 13 are applicable to claim 24, and, therefore, claim 24 has been analyzed and rejected with respect to claim 13 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elberbaum (US 7171106 B2) in view of Monroe (US 6970183 B1).

Re **claim 18**, Elberbaum discloses a majority of the features of claim 18, as discussed above in claim 16, but Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose that the related-video conditions contain a position information of neighboring areas adjacent to a position indicated by the imaging position information and the date/hour information. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the sensors may be synchronized to provide time stamped records of an event from multiple cameras (Monroe: column 6, line 62-column 7, line 4 and column 35, lines 17-19). Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a single event, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby increasing robustness of the system in the event that one camera fails to record an alarm scene (Monroe: column 35, lines 19-22).

Re **claim 19**, Elberbaum discloses a majority of the features of claim 19, as discussed above in claim 16, but Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose that the related-video conditions contain position information of invisible areas that are not picked up in the base video and the date/hour information. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia

surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the system can map the sensors (Monroe: Fig. 48; column 13, lines 64-65; column 16, lines 14-16), thus indicating on a map areas both within the sensors' field of view and not within the sensors' field of view. Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a single event and sensor mapping, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby allowing flexibility in the user's viewing of the monitored events (Monroe: column 16, lines 14-16).

Re **claim 20**, Elberbaum discloses a majority of the features of claim 20, as discussed above in claim 16, but Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose that the related-video condition generating means acquires imaging position information of video adjacent to the base video in a video feature space to generate the related-video conditions. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the sensors may be synchronized to provide time stamped records of an event from multiple cameras (Monroe: column 6, line 62-column 7, line 4 and column 35, lines 17-19). Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a

single event, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby increasing robustness of the system in the event that one camera fails to record an alarm scene (Monroe: column 35, lines 19-22).

Re **claim 21**, Elberbaum discloses a majority of the features of claim 21, as discussed above in claim 16, but Elberbaum does not explicitly disclose that the related-video condition generating means acquires imaging position information of videos having a relevancy with the base video in meaning contents to generate the related video conditions. However, Monroe discloses a multimedia surveillance and monitoring system, wherein multiple cameras may overlap to monitor a location (Monroe: Fig. 48) and the sensors may be synchronized to provide time stamped records of an event from multiple cameras (Monroe: column 6, line 62-column 7, line 4 and column 35, lines 17-19). Since both Elberbaum and Monroe relate to recording video data and additional metadata information for later retrieval, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to incorporate the multiple camera focused on a single event, as disclosed by Monroe, with the monitoring system of Elberbaum in order to provide the most comprehensive coverage of an alarm event, thereby increasing robustness of the system in the event that one camera fails to record an alarm scene (Monroe: column 35, lines 19-22).

10. Claims 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elberbaum (US 7171106 B2).

Re **claim 23**, Elberbaum discloses that the additional information of respective videos stored in the video storing means contain imaging position information, date/hour information, and imaging apparatus information (Elberbaum: column 14, lines 34-43, time/date and location information may be included in the identification code).

Elberbaum does not specifically disclose that a data structure of the video storing means is composed of a two-dimensional arrangement in which a first axis indicates the imaging position information and a second axis indicates the date/hour information and then information of the imaging apparatus that shot a predetermined imaging position at a predetermined date/hour are saved into a cell at which a predetermined imaging position information and a predetermined date/hour information intersect with each other. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious that the creation of such a two-dimensional data structure simply matches up stored video clips that include associated metadata with the particular metadata selected by the user. This methodology provides no clear benefit over any other data retrieval scheme, and its inclusion in the system would be an arbitrary decision of the system designer.

Re **claim 25**, arguments presented above in claim 23 are applicable to claim 25, and, therefore, claim 25 has been analyzed and rejected in view of arguments analogous to those presented in claim 23.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- a. Video recording apparatus and method, and centralized monitoring recording system; Nishijima et al. (US 7088907 B1)
- b. Video cassette recorder for and method of performing high-speed searching of important information, such as desired time or alarm data; Lee (US 6608962 B1)

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **CHRISTOPHER FINDLEY** whose telephone number is

(571)270-1199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30 AM-5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Marsha D. Banks-Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2621

/Christopher Findley/